DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 633 EA 020 301

AUTHOR Marshall, John D.
TITLE Influencing State-Level Textbook Decisionmaking: The Way It Was in Texas.
PUB DATE Oct 86
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at the Conference on Curriculum Theory and Classroom Practice (Dayton, OH, October 22-25, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Elementary Secondary Education; Lobbying; *Policy Formation; *Political Influences; Politics of Education; *State Action; Surveys; *Textbook Selection; *Textbook Standards
IDENTIFIERS Texas

ABSTRACT

While much has been written about state-level textbook selection and adoption, little careful, systematic data gathering has taken place. One result of this absence of formal study is that few people understand the scope and complexity of interacting persons and processes taking place whenever states make textbook decisions. This paper presents findings from one such study of the state-level textbook selection and adoption system in Texas. Among other phenomena, the paper addresses the concept of influence as it was perceived by various textbook decision makers. In an attempt to allow the chance for strong patterns to emerge from these perceptions, a multiple case study, design, historical in nature, was employed that relied on documentary, survey, and interview data. Findings indicate, in part, that special interest groups (both liberal and conservative) and textbook publishers have differing degrees of influence on different sets of textbook decision makers. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED298633

INFLUENCING STATE-LEVEL TEXTBOOK DECISIONMAKING: THE WAY IT WAS IN TEXAS

by
John D. Marshall

National College of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John D. Marshall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared for presentation at the Eighth Conference on Curriculum Theory and Classroom Practice, October 22-25, 1986, Bergamo Conference Center, Dayton, Ohio. Please do not cite without permission of author.

EA 020 301

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

While much has been written about state-level textbook selection and adoption, little careful, systematic data gathering has taken place. One result of this absence of formal study is that few people have an understanding of the scope and complexity of interacting persons and processes taking place whenever "adoption states" make textbook decisions. This paper presents findings from one such study of a state-level textbook selection and adoption system.

Among other phenomena, the writer was interested in learning more about the concept of influence as it was perceived by various textbook decisionmakers. In an attempt to allow the chance for strong patterns to emerge from these perceptions, a multiple case study design was employed, historical in nature, which relied on documentary, survey, and interview data. Findings indicate, in part, that special interest groups (both liberal and conservative) and textbook publishers have differing degrees of influence on different sets of textbook decisionmakers.

INFLUENCING STATE-LEVEL TEXTBOOK DECISIONMAKING: THE WAY IT WAS IN TEXAS

> The best textbook adoption system remains unclear, but one thing is certain: Educational policymakers should pay more attention to this critical issue. (Kirst, 1984, p. 23)

This paper describes the influence patterns of curriculum decisions[1] manifested in the selection and adoption of textbooks for Texas. It is an attempt at what Kirst & Mosher (1969) call "mapping the field," and rests within the essential framework of the politics of education. The prevalent guiding concept is "policy" or "policymaking," with state textbook decisions seen as tantamount to the operationalizing of Texas curriculum policy decisions during the period under study (1961-1981). Such decisions fit comfortably within Mann's (1975) characterization of policy problems, "which he described as public in nature, very consequential, complex, dominated by uncertainty, and involving competing interests" (Scribner & Englert, 1977, p. 26).

Because schooling in the United States is largely state-directed, each state has passed legislation to provide and conduct schools. One responsibility of each state's educational governance structure is the making of curriculum policy (Kirst, 1981; van Geel, 1976). This is a regulatory activity typically handled through a sub-structure or sub-system of the larger state educational architecture (what Kaufman [1963] called a decisionmaking "island") and involves decisions regarding course content and course offerings. Regardless of how these "islands" are structured, however,

> The inevitability of conflicting demands, wants, and needs is responsible for the necessarily political character of curriculum

> policy-making, a character which cannot be avoided even by the adoption of some mathematical decision-procedure. Some legitimate authority must decide (and perhaps bargain and compromise) among the conflicting policy viewpoints. (Kirst & Walker, 1971, p. 481)

The educational governance structure of most states, like Texas, consists of a State Department of Education (in Texas, this is the Texas Education Agency -- TEA), a Chief State School Officer (the Commissioner of Education, in Texas), and an elected or appointed State Board of Education. This structure enables a variety of tasks, most of which are routine and regulatory in nature.

Even a study of routine educational decisions such as those made during the perennial state-level adoption of textbooks in Texas is a study of politics when politics is defined as "the set of interactions that influence and shape the authoritative allocation of values" (Scribner & Englert, 1977, p. 22). The conceptual framework employed to approach the study of influence within this textbook allocation island was modeled on that used by Mazzoni & Campbell (1976) in their work on the Educational Governance Project at The Ohio State University. Their framework was adapted from political systems theory (Easton, 1965) and allocative theory (Lasswell, 1936).

Systems theory requires the researcher to remove the system from its environment for analytical purposes. Texas is one of 22 states with one type of centralized textbook adoption system or another (Whorton, 1976). The system analyzed consisted of three specific decision phases. Three general concepts guided the investigation: (1) system actors, whom I have called "key participants"[2]; (2) textbook (policy) decisions, which I have identified as taking place within three separate phases; and (3) influence, as perceived by key participants.

Decision Phases of the Texas Textbook Selection and Adoption System

Phase One: State Textbook Committee Selection A group of 15 active Texas educators, the majority of whom must be classroom teachers, receives a one-time appointment to the State Textbook Committee (STC). This committee is charged with reviewing all books submitted by publishers in each of the subject areas under consideration. Since there is a large number of subject areas (approximately one-sixth of all subjects taught in Texas elementary and secondary schools receive new books each year) and dozens of books in each, the STC members enlist the aid of advisory groups with competence in each subject area. Committee members and their advisory groups spend their summers meeting with publishers[3] and reviewing and evaluating books. In September (usually), the appointed committee meets to attend a formal hearing at which books are protested and defended. They then choose the best books (usually five) in each of the subject areas under consideration. These lists of books are then formally recommended to the Commissioner of Education.

Phase Two: Texas Education Agency Review During the years reviewed, books recommended by the STC were carefully screened during the fall months by curriculum experts at the Texas Education Agency (TEA) as well as the Commissioner of Education. During this phase, publishers whose books had been recommended by the STC could be asked to make certain content corrections, additions, and/or deletions. The Commissioner could remove as many as three books from any list of five, but he could not add books. When these reviews were completed and his decisions (if any) to delete books were made, the Commissioner formally presented his purged lists of books to the State Board for adoption at its November meeting.

Phase Three: State Board Review and Adoption Books recommended by the Commissioner were reviewed and discussed by the State Board of Education (SBE) membership. A round of protest hearings is scheduled for this group as well. This body could ask for content changes and could also decide to remove books from any list so long as at least two remained in each subject area. They could not add books to any list. A vote is taken on each book on each list. From the final adoption lists, districts and schools throughout the state select texts.

This multi-phase decisionmaking system epitomized the state's desire to balance certain values -- neutral competence, executive leadership, and representativeness (Kaufman, 1963). The system's bureaucratic design also acted as a series of "checks and balances" with regard to the flow of decision power. In the first phase, professional practitioners -- representing "neutral competence" -- bore the heaviest workload, sifting through large numbers of textbooks in search of the best "tools" for their trade. Their decisions were then subject to approval by the Commissioner of Education -- representing "executive leadership" -- whose concerns included those of cost and uniformity of materials (based upon guidelines, called "proclamations," developed by the TEA and adopted by the SBE).[4] But even the Commissioner was subject to the higher authority of the State Board of Education -- characterizing "representativeness" -- which acted on behalf of the public at large. Ideally, such a system brings together information from all who might have an "affected interest" in textbook decisions: educators in the field, state educational administrators, and the general public (van Geel, 1976).

In addition to those empowered to make textbook decisions at each phase, two groups of non-decisionmakers also participated. The first group was textbook publishers. Members of this group were included in the process from the outset of its legislative revitilization in 1949.[5] As representatives of their wares, publishers were basically selling materials to practitioners during phase one, repairing materials for the state administrators during phase two, and representing (and ocassionally defending) materials to the board during phase three.

The second group consisted of "concerned citizens." This contingent emerged in the late 1950s in Texas[6] and, by 1961, had managed to have formal input at each of the three decisionmaking phases.[7] Eventually, the general public's awareness of the Texas textbook process came to center on the participation of this handful of petitioners (as the system labeled them) and they became known as "textbook protestors."[8]

Over the years, the pattern of petitioner involvement developed into a set of formal hearings before the STC, the Commissioner, and the SBE (see outline of events, pp.7-8). Until 1982, only those protesting books took part as petitioners and only publishers or their

representatives could speak in favor of (or defend) books. Through the efforts of People for the American Way, that practice was legally changed to permit both opponents and proponents of textbooks to speak at these hearings. Since that time, additional changes have taken place which have altered the system significantly, including the alteration of what I have identified as the second decisionmaking phase (e.g., the Commissioner is no longer permitted to remove textbooks from lists forwarded by the STC). But the Texas textbook selection and adoption process remained relatively stable during the years 1969 - 1981, with three decision groups carrying out their responsibilities and two non-decisionmaking groups contributing throughout. It is that system and those key participants which I selected for study.

Influence in the Texas Textbook Selection and Adoption System

The Texas textbook selection and adoption system, then, can best be understood as a regulatory procedure of the state's educational governance structure charged with allocating resources (textbooks) to the state's public schools. Based upon the principle of "affected interests," this annual task is shared by three groups of decisionmakers reflecting different values and representing different constituencies (Wirt, 1976). The stable years of the system under study here also included the contributions at each decisionmaking stage of two groups of non-decisionmakers, publishers and petitioners, who were stakeholders of a different sort in these decisions. This system is described as political because of the interactions among and between these groups in their attempts to shape decision outcomes.

A singularly critical notion related to any study of policy decisionmaking is that of influence. Accepting influence as a major factor in the Texas textbook operation created the need to borrow from allocative theory:

> [T]he utility of a political systems orientation provide[s] the point of departure. This orientation emphasizes the functional relationships among the actors who constitute educational policy systems as demands are converted into decisions. Allocative

> theory [is] used to augment the political systems approach. Consistent with those insights, there [is] the assumption that education policymaking is a competitive process, the essence of which resides in the interplay of influence. The explanation for policy decisions, from this perspective, comes from revealing the patterns of accommodation among competing actors, actors who differ greatly in resources, intention, and skill. These patterns are organized through a governmental structure and are channeled and constrained by other systemic features as well. (Mazzoni & Campbell, 1976, p. 4)

Influence, while a complex concept, has been defined in a common sense fashion by Robert Dahl (1976, p. 29) as follows:

> [S]uppose there are only two people in a system, A and B. A influences B to the extent that he changes B's actions or predispositions in some way.[9]

And although the concept of influence is closely related to those of power and control, I draw careful distinctions here. Power, in the case of Texas textbook decisions, was a bureaucratic design component of the overall system. Professional educators made initial decisions, the Commissioner of Education and his staff had the power to alter or overturn those decisions, and the State Board of Education had the power to alter or overturn those of the Commissioner. Control, here, is seen as the way in which decisions were constrained by the rules and guidelines of the system itself. Mann (1977, p. 68) describes control as "a determinate, or at least a dominant influence. There is an idea of sufficient command in controlling." As designed, there was no possible way that publishers or petitioners could be seen as having power or control over textbook

decisions (although it has been argued that, in Texas, both groups might be seen as having some degree of control over textbook content).

Because publishers and petitioners took part in a procedure authoritatively designed to allocate values (textbooks), I assumed that there may have been some degree of influence intended by petitioners and publishers to be felt by those on the STC, in the TEA, and on the SBE as they undertook their tasks. In order to operationalize the concept of influence, I used a variation of the reputational method, one in which I asked those in each decision group to describe how, and to what extent, their decisions were influenced by members of the two groups of non-decisionmakers. Members of the influencing groups, in turn, were asked about their perceptions of the extent to which they succeeded in influencing the decisionmakers and the nature of their influential efforts. The principal assumption in using this approach, according to Mazzoni & Campbell (1976, pp. 5-6), "is that such respondents have the knowledge and candor to provide valid general assessments."

In the section following, I briefly outline the research design and methods.

Research Design and Methodology

Any systematic study of influence within the Texas textbook selection and adoption system will be burdened with a myriad of design problems, the most critical of which is focus. Every year, literally hundreds of people throughout the state are involved for as long as six months in this process, which is briefly outlined below:

(1) Members of the STC are selected from throughout Texas in late spring. They, in turn, each select dozens of people to serve as their advisors in reviewing textbooks.

(2) Books offered for adoption are made available to the above people and placed at designated sites throughout the state. While STC members and advisors review books so, too, do concerned citizens who, eventually, document their concerns and submit them to the TEA. These documents are known as "Bills of Particular."

(3) Publishers are both meeting with STC members and advisors and responding to citizens' "Bills" throughout the summer. Publishers' written responses are known as "Answers."

(4) Members of the STC meet in Austin, Texas in late summer. Armed with complets sets of all "Bills" and "Answers," they -- along with the Commissioner of Education or his designate -- sit through a public hearing at which time those who have submitted "Bills" protest textbooks and publishers respond. Following this hearing the STC selects textbooks.

(5) Selected books are reviewed by the Commissioner and his staff and a final list of books is recommended for adoption to the SBE.

(6) The SBE conducts a second public hearing in the fall. Again, citizens may protest books and publishers may defend them. Following this hearing, the SBE formally adopts textbooks for use throughout Texas. (see "How textbooks . . .", 1972; Seldenberger, 1953)

Given the resource and time constraints with which I operated it was impossible to look at this phenomenon as it unfolded. Instead, a historical perspective was chosen.

Of all the "adoption states," Texas -- with its annual public textbook hearings and internationally known textbook protestors -- seems to produce more than its share of sensational textbook decisions. My intention from the outset was to steer clear of atypical cases; I wanted to know how influence was routinely perceived. Furthermore, I needed some way to define my universe of key participants. For these and other reasons discussed below, a multiple case study design was employed.

The annual spectrum of textbooks sought presented another focus problem. Each year, the state of Texas adopts new textbooks in approximately one-sixth of all K-12 curriculum areas. There are few patterns in the areas slated to receive new texts, and the books vary wildly. Elementary earth science, business law, bilingual basal readers, and psychology are a sample of the books which can be included for adoption during the same year. In an effort to refine the

investigation, I decided to select a single book/series offered for adoption within each of the case study years. This decision gave me a sub-set of subject specialist STC members in each case from which to draw particular data[10] and allowed many interview respondents to be more specific in their recollections of the process.

A second advantage of selecting one book/series was in establishing a more workable universe of publishers and petitioners. The adoption of a quantity of various books each year brings a large cast of non-decisionmakers into the procedure. By selecting a single text, I could concentrate my data gathering efforts on one set of publishers in each case.[11] The same was true of petitioners: Only those who had protested the book/series I selected would inhabit my universe of petitioner informants.

Equally important was the narrowing effect this decision had on my work with primary and secondary documents.

I decided to look for cases which were not clustered in one period of time. This would lessen the probability of extraordinary influence resulting from a national "movement" such as that of curriculum relevance in the late 1960's or that of censorship in the mid-1970's. While there was never any intention on my part to look at case study data as representative of some decade or time span, I was hoping to find cases that were evenly distributed throughout the period ranging from 1961 - 1981. Unfortunately, this proved impossible. Additional variables were added as my preliminary interviews progressed and are discussed in some detail elsewhere (Marshall, 1985).

For similar reasons, I set out to select textbooks designed for subject areas which generated concern and activity from petitioners and yet proved to be "routine" or unsensational in a given year. I hoped that the selection of three cases for study would allow me to understand "typical" influence patterns of the system within the time frame I had established as a stable period. To lend some legitimacy to this intention, I decided to select a different subject area for each case. Each subject area has its own proponents and opponents, its own curriculum guidelines, its own group of Agency curriculum experts, and above all, its own history within the Texas

textbook selection and adoption system. By selecting three distinctly different subject areas, I felt more certain that my data would reflect a much more generic understanding of decisionmaking influence.

As difficult as the study was to design, my hardest task was finding publishers willing to participate in the study or even talk with me about Texas textbook selection and adoption.[12] With few exceptions, those I contacted either neglected to respond to my letter of inquiry or, in two cases, flatly refused to participate. Only with the assistance and influence of several education professors at The University of Texas at Austin was I able to secure the necessary cooperation. I understand the weakness of selecting case studies primarily on the basis of the agreement of key participants to allow such an investigation to proceed, but I believe that this shortcoming is far outweighed by the advantages of having specific publishers' observations and insights. In some respects, this may be the study's greatest limitation and in others, its greatest strength.

The Cases Studied

Elementary Social Studies -- 1971 Sixteen firms submitted books in this subject area. It was the first time Texas had called for a complete textbook series covering grades 1-6 and, according to members of the TEA curriculum staff responsible for writing this proclamation, the first time publishers had produced such series for what was known as "the new social studies." I selected the *Seeing Near and Far* series edited by O.L. Davis, Jr. and published by the American Book Company (ABC). For the purposes of this study, American is seen as a company of average size. ABC did not have elementary social studies books in Texas classrooms at the time of this adoption. In 1971, Texas needed more than 1.5 million social studies books for distribution throughout grades 1-6 during the first three years of its textbook contracts. American's series (six books) was priced at $35.01. "Making the list" in Texas allows a publisher an equal chance at sharing the market with no more than four other firms; if American had done so, it might have been possible to capture 20% of the sales in this subject area. Selling 50,000 series would have

produced revenues in excess of 1.8 million dollars, a moderate stake when compared with the state's purchase of reading textbooks.

Basal Reading -- 1980 Twelve different basal reading series were submitted in this premier K-8 basal series adoption. The series I selected was *Reading 720*, edited by Ted Clymer and offered by Ginn & Company. Compared to American Book Company, Ginn is a "large" elhi publishing firm. Ginn entered the 1980 reading adoption with some of its supplementary readers already in use in the upper elementary grades. Texas expected to purchase more than 4 million reading books between 1981-1984. The price of the Ginn series (fifteen books covering eleven levels) was $91.47. Since each adopted series might capture about one-fifth of the Texas market, Ginn's being listed might have resulted in initial (3 year) sales of more than 800,000 series, thus bringing Ginn revenues in excess of 7 million dollars. This is an example of a potentially "large" sale.

High School Economics -- 1981 This call resulted in offerings from eleven different publishers. I selected a book entitled *Hard Choices: The Economics of the American Free Enterprise System (2nd edition)* for focus in this case. The book was co-authored by William A. and Geneva J. Luker and published by the Sterling Swift Publishing Company. Swift is a small, Austin, Texas-based firm which had never before published an economics book for use in high schools. Seventy thousand economics books would be needed during the first three years of the adoption period and, if Swift could capture twenty percent of these sales, its $14.95 book would bring revenues in the neighborhood of $150,000. Compared to the other cases, this would be a small sale.

Data Collection

Coded survey instruments were distributed to all members of the STC (N=45) and SBE (N=43) during each of the years selected.[13] Respondents were assured that data from these questionnaires would be used in aggregate form and that they would not be individually identified in

my report. Cumulative survey response rates exceeded seventy-three percent for the State Textbook Committee and sixty-five percent for members of the State Board of Education.

While awaiting the survey returns, I combed the Texas Education Agency archives and collected information on each of the three selection and adoption years. Examples of these data include minutes of SBE meetings, records of the number of times publishers met with STC members, and instructions given to the STC on how to conduct its textbook reviews. In addition, the archives contain complete verbatim transcripts of the hearings before the STC and Commissioner of Education.[14]

In the case of both large decision groups, individual survey data were transfered to aggregate form. Using these master forms, I randomly selected a minimum of 25% of STC and SBE respondents from each year whose individual questionnaires most closely reflected the modal aggregate responses. A total of ten former STC members and ten former SBE members participated in interviews. All interviews were tape recorded and lasted approximately thirty minutes each. All STC and SBE interviewees were assured that they would remain anonymous.

Rather than collect survey data from TEA decisionmakers prior to interviews I used the basic survey format as an interview protocol. Six people -- the Commissioner and elementary social studies specialist in 1971, the Commissioner and reading specialist in 1980, and the Commissioner and economics specialist in 1981 -- were interviewed from the TEA group. Each of these interviews was tape recorded and lasted approximately one hour. While all of the TEA specialists spoke "on the record," one of the commissioners asked not to be identified by name. In addition to these Agency personnel, general conversations and/or interviews were held with another former Commissioner and four additional TEA employees connected with the acquisition of textbooks, bringing the total number of informants in this group to eleven.

I intended to locate and interview at least three publishers connected with each book/series chosen for study. In the end, a total of seven interviews were held with publishers directly connected with the these books. Each was tape recorded, and most lasted at least one hour. Nearly all of these gentlemen spoke with the assurance that they would remain anonymous. These

interviews, when added to preliminary interviews and conversations held with publishers prior to the finalization of my design, brought the total number of informants in this group to fifteen.

Two people filed Bills of Particular (protests) against the 1971 American Book Company elementary social studies series, five against Ginn's 1980 basal readers, and fourteen against Swift's economics book in 1981. The number of protestors who actually participated in the formal hearings, however, was reduced to one in 1971, three in 1980, and one in 1981. These five persons became my pool of petitioner respondents. Of these, four agreed to be interviewed. All interviews were tape recorded, and the average interview lasted thirty minutes. In an effort to better understand this group I decided to conduct two additional interviews with persons who had had experience as petitioners but who had made no direct protests of my focus books. Including these additional petitioners brought the total number of interviewees in this group to six.

In sum, an impressive number of key participants who had one sort of intimate involvement or another with the 1971 Texas elementary social studies adoption (and the series submitted by the American Book Company), the 1980 basal reading adoption (and the series submitted by Ginn & Company), and the 1981 high school economics adoption (and the book submitted by the Sterling Swift Publishing Company) have provided a rich base of survey and oral history data for this study. These data, in combination with available primary and secondary sources, became the foundation for the historical reconstruction of each case study. From these reconstructions come the findings pertaining to influence patterns of petitioners and publishers within the Texas textbook selection and adoption system presented in the section which follows.

Petitioner Influence on Textbook Decisions

State Textbook Committee members. On the question of petitioner influence, STC responses were mixed. Slightly more members from the 1971 case recognized petitioner influence on their textbook decisions than those who answered "none." In the two more recent cases, the majority of respondents believed that they were not influenced by petitioners. The majority of respondents who did recognize petitioner influence claimed that their decisions about

certain books had been influenced somewhat by petitioners. This nebulous awareness of petitioner influence was often explained as follows:

> STC Member 1: It probably caused me to look at . . . I think that year they were social studies books [which] were up [for adoption] . . . Yes, [the testimony] did influence me somewhat. [pause] I mean it caused me to take another look at how I was voting, but I don't know that it changed my vote. I don't believe it did completely. (Tape no. 16)

> STC Member 2: By that stage of the game [the STC hearing], we had done *so* much work, *so* much evaluation, that our minds were pretty well made up as to what our top choices were going to be and what we found objectionable or what we really liked about particular textbooks. . . . I was open-minded to what [petitioners] had to say [but] ultimately, it did not affect my voting choices in the end. (Tape no. 17)

When asked to identify the source of petitioner influence, STC respondents who recognized such influence were again mixed, with more 1971 respondents identifying Bills of Particular as the source of influence than petitioners' testimony at textbook hearings. In the later cases, petitioners' testimony at textbook hearings was identified by most committee members who had been influenced. One STC member noted that:

> When we got the first batch [of the thirteen volume set of "Bills" and "Answers"] we were all interested to see if what we'd heard [during the hearings] and what we'd read were the same thing. And it seemed to be. After that, you didn't pay any attention to

> [the printed materials]. Why go through that stuff? You've heard it once. (Tape no. 24)

Two possible explanations are offered for differences in the nature and extent of petitioner influence over the time period studied. Some of this difference may be due, first, to the fact that Bills of Particular (without publishers' Answers) were made available to 1971 STC members at least a week before they went to Austin to attend the textbook hearing. The later groups, on the other hand, did not receive those materials (both "Bills" and "Answers") until the day their hearings began. Second, the 1971 STC hearing lasted but one day compared to five days in both 1980 and 1981, and the number of petitioners as well as the volume of written "Bills" and "Answers" in the early 1980s had increased significantly. Greater numbers of petitioners criticizing a single text or series over several days may have been an important factor in the more recent STC members' identification of the textbook hearings as the primary source of petitioner influence.

Asked to identify the focus or major concern of petitioners who protested textbooks, STC members in 1971 and 1980 were divided between "organization and presentation of content" and "other" (most often categorized as personal bias). Most textbook committee members from 1981 chose "other" in response to this question. Study of the Bills of Particular and interviews with petitioners clearly indicates that petitioners, as Last (1984) contended, were frequently not concerned with how textbook content was organized and presented but, instead, with what content was and was not included in books. These data may explain why petitioners had so little influence on members of the STC. It seems logical to conclude that decisionmakers who interpret petitioners' concerns to be largely unrelated to questions of pedagogical importance are more likely to ignore them.

Records from those years show that in each case studied, heavily protested books were selected and lightly protested ones were not. When seen in combination with respondent data it seems that petitioners had little effect on the textbook decisions of STC members.

The Commissioner and his staff. Interviewees from the Texas Education Agency group acknowledged that petitioners' most observable influence on Agency personnel has been that textbook protests have forced TEA staff to pay close attention to the wording of subsequent proclamations. Comparing the proclamations from each case, it is evident that these documents became successively longer as they addressed more issues (e.g., the theory of evolution) and successively more specific (e.g., defining free enterprise). Two acknowledgements of this phenomenon illustrate how persons from differing groups perceive this sort of influence:

> SBE Member: I think the proclamations were colored by the protesters. If you had a whole seige of protesters in one year on one particular subject, . . . the proclamations, the next [time they were prepared], in order to not have so many of the protests, were colored in the direction of eliminating that -- being more specific about that [area of protest]. (Tape no. 18)

> TEA Member: I remember the first year [sex bias was an area of petitioner concern], we thought well, why haven't we been looking at the girls? Why did someone have to tell us to start looking at the way little girls are treated in stories . . . ? (Tape no. 30)

Petitioner influence on the proclamation wording is of major importance when we consider that "adherence to the proclamation" was the sole textbook evaluation criterion used by Agency personnel and the only basis they had for action against textbooks. This meant that TEA staff were required to make "judgement calls" concerning content issues (e.g., ethnic stereotyping) identified by petitioners at previous adoption hearings as important enough to be included in the proclamation.

In other words, petitioners acquired the ability to "guide" those at the TEA in their textbook reviews. The later proclamations (1980 & 1981) state that petitioner allegations will be given careful consideration during Agency textbook reviews. If, for example, a book selected by the STC had fifty pictures of which five were protested, petitioners could feel safe in assuming that judgements would be passed as to the appropriateness of at least those five pictures. This is not to suggest that the other forty-five pictures would not be perused by staff, but to say that only those five pictures which had become issues, with arguments presented for and against them, *required* judgement calls.

Members of this group acknowledge an everpresent awareness of petitioner issues yet seldom perceive their decisions as resulting from petitioner influence. If the record of changes required by the Commissioner can be seen as a valid empirical indicator of petitioner influence on TEA textbook decision outcomes, petitioner influence was minimal. A very small percentage of Agency-requested content changes (e.g., replacing pictures or stories) was traceable to petitioners' textbook protests. This suggests both that Agency staff conducted quite thorough textbook reviews apart from the "guidance" of textbook protests and that petitioners were not particularly efficacious *vis a vis* their attempts to have those at the Agency call for changes in textbook content.

State Board of Education members A majority of members from both the earlier and later boards recognized some petitioner influence on their choices of certain textbooks. This finding fits the pattern which emerged regarding board members' textbook evaluations. Those petitioners who were active at the initial textbook hearing and who carried their protests to the board's hearing had the strongest chance of drawing attention to the problems they had with certain books. The record shows that the "certain books" board members were referring to were, for the most part, texts in what are commonly considered to be the basic subjects (e.g., reading, social studies, and science) and would inevitably "come up as very controversial" as one SBE member put it. Another board member recalled that

> The ones I read were history books, civics books, government books, because I *knew* what we were going to get from the protesters because we'd heard it all before. And / wanted to know whether it said what they said it said. (Tape no. 29)

Petitioner influence on SBE members resulted largely from their testimony at the board's textbook hearing. Attempts by the 1971 board to remove several books, the 1980 board's directions to the Commissioner regarding "intensive phonics" books, and the boards' directions to the Commissioner to request changes in all social studies books and several economics books in 1981 can all be traced to specific protests made by petitioners at the board's textbook hearing. Reason exists to refrain from alleging a direct cause-and-effect relationship, however, for the board consisted of a majority of conservative-thinking individuals who may have called for those changes and removals referred to above without the petitioners' activities. Nevertheless, my findings strongly suggest that most board members may have only looked at heavily protested books in the first place. Below are several of their common responses in this regard:

> SBE Member 1: And of course, really, we had so many things to do that I did not read each book. If there was an objection or a criticism of textbooks, yes. Otherwise, no.
> Interviewer: The people you asked to look at [the books] really only looked at the ones that were under criticism . . .?
> SBE Member 2: I would think for the most part, yes.
> (Tape no. 15)

> SBE Member 2: I didn't examine all the books, no. . . . I did examine the parts, though, that were challenged. All of them.
> (Tape no. 32)

This leads me to believe that it was highly unlikely that board members independently discovered "problems" in textbook content without the benefit of petitioners' information. The obvious exception would be cases in which the board specifically called (in the proclamation) for content which they could not find or found insufficient when the time came for them to adopt the books (see endnote 4).

Also, it seems that petitioners had personal avenues of influence with SBE members outside the legislated system. Some petitioners regularly contacted board members regarding textbooks recommended for adoption. For example, several veteran publishers agreed with allegations made by People for the American Way that Mel and Norma Gabler (veteran "protesters" in the Texas procedure [Piasecki, 1982]), at least, had managed over the years to become quite influential through their personal relationships with a number of board members (People for . . ., 1983). The following is an example of information I received in a number of interviews:

> We received letters, primarily from the protesters who came [to the hearing], on a regular basis. Some of them, particularly the Gablers, would call around and talk to everybody trying to influence their vote . . . (Tape no. 29)

One former Commissioner assured me that members of the board were influenced in this manner:

> [Board members] don't have *time* to read all those materials and study them. And here comes a protester that they *like*, and they have *confidence* in, and she says, or he says to the board member, "You know what's in that book? Thus-and-so." [pause] He [the board member] gets right on it. . . . An ordinary citizen, a protester, can [contact a board member] all she wants to. Or he. And they *do*! They *definitely* do! They've influenced board members, yes. No question about that. (Tape no. 43)

Petitioners, it appears, have little effect on the textbook decisions made by members of the STC. Members of the TEA tend to pay close attention to specific protests but don't appear to make many decisions in the petitioners' favor. Petitioners appear to have their "best shot" at the decisions arrived at by those who serve on the state board.

Publisher Influence on Textbook Decisions

State Textbook Committee members. No patterns exist in textbook committee members' responses regarding the question of publisher influence. Two-thirds of the 1971 group recognized some degree of publisher influence, nearly two-thirds of the 1980 group believed they were not influenced by publishers, and 1981 STC members were evenly divided on the question.

Virtually all STC respondents agreed that the three major selling points publishers emphasized when presenting their books were "organization and presentation of content," "adherence to the proclamation," and "pedagogical strength." Publishers claimed that "adherence to the proclamation" was not stressed nearly as much as the other criteria identified by STC respondents. Nevertheless, STC members understood publishers to be speaking to the same aspects of texts that teachers judged as most important. This is a likely explanation for why, as the following STC members' excerpts indicate, publishers did seem to have some success marketing books to that group:

> STC Member 1: There were things that I might have missed if they [publishers] had not pointed them out. And this is generally true of all of them. I mean, I looked over the books, but perhaps not as carefully as I would have if no one had . . . [pause] You know, whenever they explained it . . . [pause] it did help to have them there. Of course they *all* had representatives. (Tape no. 54)

> STC Member 2: . . . sometimes [publishers] were able to bring out some points about their programs that perhaps we hadn't caught. (Tape no. 17)

The majority of textbook committee members who acknowledged having been influenced by publishers indicated that this influence took place at the publishers' "Round Robin" presentations. Whether made in school cafeterias or fine restaurants, these presentations were intentionally focused on the strengths of the presenter's and the weaknesses of the competition's products. As one publisher explained:

> The one thing you better do [in order to have a chance at making the list]: you better know your product [and] you better know your competitor's product. You better evaluate how you beat your competitor and then whenever you start to emphasize something say, "Well, I wish you would look at page so-and-so because this is the way we present The Articles of Confederation . . . We've got three more pages of coverage of Teddy Roosevelt running up San Juan Hill than the competitors do." Those kinds of things. You pick out whatever you think is going to be a definitive plus and you *use* that!" (Tape no. 47)

This understanding of the selective and comparative information publishers provided to STC members and advisors was discussed by publishers and STC members alike.

I found that most STC members and advisors actually conducted two types of textbook evaluations -- the first to determine the "good" books from the large number of those submitted for selection, and a second to comparatively determine the best of those good books. By playing their books off the others being considered, publishers were "guiding" the comparative evaluations of those in this decision group in much the same way that petitioners "guided" the evaluations of

TEA staff. In short, publishers defined which aspects of the "good" books needed careful attention and were thus able to guide decisionmakers toward their product's strengths and competing books' weaknesses. Decisions regarding the ranking of best books by a committee were often based on these very measures involving specific aspects of books:

> Publisher: What I think [STC members] mean [when they recognize publisher influence] is that, by repeated presentation, either in conference or in general meetings, features of the books that they may not otherwise have seen were presented to them. . .
>
> Interviewer: So it's really just a matter of receiving information . . .
>
> Publisher: Well, I think that's what the committee members are talking about, yes. . . . It's information and it's a biased presentation, I suppose, of the information. (Tape no. 31)

Other forms of publisher influence were apparent but not prevalent. Mention was made by publishers and STC members both, for example, of how some administrators or curriculum supervisors in certain districts were "sold" on publisher X's materials (or publisher X's company, or publisher X's field representative) before the campaign began. These people may have wanted to stay with a successful program, they may have been satisfied with the publishing company's service, they may have been involved with an earlier pilot or convinced of the books' goodness during a pre-selection campaign, or they may simply have been reflecting a long professional friendship between themselves and the publisher's representative. Whatever the reason for this "pre-selection," publishers and some STC members realized that publishers' influential efforts in any textbook selection campaign were not only limited to STC members and advisors.

The Commissioner and his staff. The findings related to publisher influence on textbook decisions made during the second phase of the Texas textbook selection and adoption system are far

more speculative than those related to publisher influence on the STC and SBE. In order to understand this influence, we must first consider the relationship between publishers and TEA personnel.

Agency staff responsible for drafting textbook proclamations and reviewing books selected by the STC knew members of the textbook publishing industry as both salespersons and pedagogically well-informed cohorts. Edgerton (1969, p. 286) refers to publishers as the "first cousins" of professional educators, and my data support the correctness of this metaphor. Most major publishing houses maintained a close relationship with TEA staff, one which served the dual purposes of keeping the publishers attuned to the directions in which proclamation guidelines were likely to change and maintaining a professional and personal bond between themselves and Agency staff. One former Commissioner told of how important the trust factor was in these relationships:

> [TEA employees] were public people. . . . They had various contacts with publishers. We discouraged any socialization, although there was some. . . . You just had to depend on the fact that these people are supposed to be professional folks . . . (Tape no. 1)

Publishers who "worked" the TEA were valued by its staff for their knowledge of national educational trends as well as their understanding of the elhi industry. What is more, publishers continued to keep their fingers on the pulse of Texas education with their frequent travels throughout the state:

> Publisher: If publishers didn't have someone who was in that Agency on a bi-monthly or a bi-weekly basis trying to determine their thinking of what those people expected in books, you couldn't play the game. You couldn't bid because your book wouldn't meet the [proclamation].

> Interviewer: So one of the things that that did, then, was complicate the jobs of people like you. It gave you another territory that you had to pay attention to.
> Respondent: That's right! And that was, in the long run, a very i mportant territory. . . . I became acquaintances, friends, and som etimes offered advice as to what was going into those books. And this advice might have been influenced by what we had in our books. (Tape no. 8)

Agency staff, seldom able to speak with teachers and supervisors throughout the state, used textbook publishers to learn such information as what materials worked best in which districts and which subject specialists needed what resources. Publishers belonged to many of the same professional educational associations as Agency curriculum specialists. Both groups, it appeared, were working to provide Texas schools with the best possible textbooks. Agency staff and publishers were, as the following TEA staffer notes, colleagues in the textbook endeavor:

> . . . what we try and do in the proclamation here, is reflect what teachers say they need in their instructional program, because we view ourselves as working arm-in-arm with the public school and the publishers to bring about better instructional materials that teachers need. (Tape no. 30)

Beyond their professional relationships, many personal relationships were struck and maintained between publishers and Agency personnel. Each of the Commissioners claimed personal friends within the elhi industry and several of the publishers interviewed mentioned their personal friendships with staff and former Commissioners. "I enjoy the publishers" one former Commissioner told me. "I think they really wanted to satisfy the Texas market . . . I found [them]

to be honest and above-board . . . All in all, they're a fine group of men and women" (Tape no. 43).

Personal and professional relationships notwithstanding, there was no evidence to suggest that such connections resulted in specific textbook decisions rendered "as a favor to a friend." Instead, my findings suggest that the mutual respect and trust between publishers and those at the TEA gave publishers influence *potential*. This influence potential was most obvious in the drafting of proclamations and was likely to come into play during staff reviews of specific textbook protests. As for required content changes resulting from Agency reviews, I collected some purely speculative evidence from respondents that TEA staff seldom called for anything beyond "cut and paste" changes in textbooks because of their awareness of the exhorbitant cost, in time and dollars, to publishers. In short, the relationship publishers cultivated and sustained with Agency personnel provided them with what Dahl (1961) calls "indirect influence" which, even for publishers, is quite difficult to assess.

State Board of Education members. Most board members recognized no publisher influence in their textbook decisions. Several reasons for this strong pattern of response appear reasonable. First, board members were conscious of the influence potential of publishers and made it a point not to allow themselves to be influenced by persons who made their living convincing others of their products' goodness. I found practically no mention, by publishers or SBE members, of personal or colleagial relationships existing between the two groups although there was no dislike or distrust mentioned either. "[None of them] made faces at me or were rude or anything like that" one board member recounted, "but there was [pause] nothing out of the way at all [regarding the purpose of their friendship]" (Tape no. 22). In the words of another:

> We had no contact with them at all. In fact, I'll tell you what: I really don't think the publishers made any effort to [influence us] for several reasons. I think it would have backfired if they had. There are a lot of people on the board who felt like the publishers had had their say when they wrote the books and

> submitted them for adoption. They'd had their turn . . . to do their thing. (Tape no. 29)

Apparently, board members' fears of conflict of interest were strong enough to prevent most publishers from establishing the sort of personal influence potential with SBE members they enjoyed with Agency personnel.

Receiving pages and pages of protest and rebuttal and then listening to hours and hours of hearing testimony became a standard operating procedure preceding SBE textbook decisions. As one SBE member groused, "we had to listen to [it all]." I asked one member if this exchange of views didn't make *some* difference:

> Not really. They did defend . . . the books within the parameters of the system. . . Generally speaking, it was so cut and dried that I didn't have any definite opinion one way or the other after I got through hearing them. (Tape no. 21)

A strong finding that may help to further explain the absence of publisher influence on SBE members had to do with the way in which publishers typically presented themselves at the board's textbook hearing. Most board members paid closest attention to heavily protested books and little attention to the "Bills," "Answers," and transcriptions of testimony from the first hearing. Furthermore, publishers seldom spoke in defense of their textbooks before the board. Thus, most board members who attended their textbook hearing and listened to petitioners' protests did not have the benefit of hearing the publishers' side of the story:

> SBE Member: Now, when we'd get in a board meeting and get ready to adopt a book and the petitioners made their oral reports, we would always ask the textbook publisher for a reply. And almost invariably they'd say, "We stand on our written reply" and they'd leave it at that. They didn't answer orally. . . . Well,

> we had copies of those written replies, but gee, volumes to read. And I'll be frank with you: I never read them word for word.
>
> Interviewer: So you think the fact that publishers didn't bother to speak might have hurt them in the long run?
>
> SBE Member: Well, I don't know whether it hurt or not.
>
> Interviewer: Well, . . . if you didn't read their responses, then you didn't know how they were answering those criticisms.
>
> SBE Member: That's right. That's right. . . .I don't know why [they didn't speak]. (Tape no. 36)

Since this circumstance seems to have been the typical scenario, it is not surprising that SBE members recognized virtually no publisher influence when making textbook decisions.

Finally, perhaps the simplest analysis of why publishers had so little apparent influence on members of the State Board of Education can be understood best by the comments of two board members:

> SBE Member 1: Frankly, hell, they were salesmen. (Tape no. 15)

> SBE Member 2: They were trying to sell books! I didn't think they were too interested in the quality of the book [either]. (Tape no. 22)

In the section which follows these findings are discussed in an effort to discern the hows and whys of influence patterns within the Texas textbook selection and adoption system.

Discussion

To say that members of the State Textbook Committee had a difficult task is an understatement. They received virtually no support or guidance from the state governance

structure and had little experience, in most cases, conducting textbook evaluations. Nevertheless, most found the experience memorable, challenging, and rewarding -- both personally and professionally.

Most STC members concentrated on the collection of books offered in their own subject area and left the evaluation of others to their advisors. More often than not, STC members seldom met with these advisors, and in a number of cases, had never even met the advisors (who were recommended by the district curriculum supervisor of superintendent). When it was time for the STC member to travel to Austin for the public hearing and textbook balloting, she gathered the prioritized lists of her advisors and left ready for the task at hand.

My data indicate that STC members and their advisors took their jobs quite seriously and did, indeed, spend most of their summers evaluating texts. Mixed throughout this period, too, were many contacts from members of the publishing industry. Although each STC member was only required to permit each publisher one "Round Robin" session, the records show certain committee members with more than a dozen contacts from a *single* publishing concern. Given the number of books to be considered for selection, the number and variety of subject areas receiving new texts, and the number of STC members and advisors operating in any given year we must acknowledge the truly remarkable job these men and women from the elhi publishing industry did in attempting to make a difference in the decisions of those picking textbooks.

As I noted earlier, much of the energy publishers expended throughout this process was an attempt to guide these decisionmakers toward one book/series and away from others. STC members and their advisors seldom made use of local or district curriculum guidelines and reported using the state's textbook guidelines (proclamations) primarily for the purpose of shortening the original number of books before beginning their more careful analyses. Typically, some form of "check list" -- either provided by the TEA or a district curriculum coordinator or created by themselves with the help of their advisors -- was used when evaluating the mountain of texts available. In most cases, these check lists were generic enough so as to be used with texts in all subject areas.

Textbook evaluators with no previous experience, no training, and only general notions about what makes one text better than another are prime candidates for the entertaining and thoroughly informative sessions conducted by publishers, many of whom are former teachers and all of whom "speak the same language" as teachers (see Hall-Quest, 1918; Edmonson, 1931; Dessauer, 1974)). Publishers' use of selective information as a political resource (Sroufe, 1977) "simplifies the teacher's . . . examination of a texbook by pointing out the features that [the publishers] consider unique" (Brown, 1952, p. 276; See, also Black, 1967; "How to . . . ", n.d.). Textbooks, under these circumstances, are as likely to be sold as selected (Spalding, 1955; See also Jensen, 1931; McDonald, 1930; Jovanovich, 1962; "Textbook salesmen . . .", 1974).

Publishers enjoyed prolonged and polished contact time with STC members while petitioners saw the STC members (never their advisors) only at the hearing. Petitioners, unlike publishers, were unlikely or unwilling to empathize with teachers' needs. They carped about flaws in the same books publishers had highlighted as strong. Petitioners were frequently perceived as ideologues whose presentations were received in a "with us or against us" vein by members of the STC. Not so with publishers, whose successes (and salaries) depended on pleasing the greatest number of potential customers. Not surprisingly, too, few STC members were about to change decisions that were arrived at by so many people working over so long a period of time. My point, simply, is that the two groups of non-decisionmakers were not only perceived differently by those sitting on the STC but had different types of access and quite different approaches to these decisionmakers as well. Who can be surpirsed, then, that petitioners had the least influence upon this group while publishers had the most?

Conversely, members of the SBE were more likely to heed the call of the petitioners. Board members were veterans in this process who had helped to fashion the textbook proclamations and knew what they were looking for. They seldom had the time to read volumes of print information related to the specific protests and rebuttals, but made it their business to look at controversial books and passages. They sat and listened to protest after protest as publishers remained largely silent. In most cases, board members knew petitioners from their appearances

before the board as well as personal contacts (Ciolli, 1984). These were constituents; the publishers were salespersons.

Petitioners were more likely to be showing concern about the aspects of textbooks most important to board members. The SBE respected the work done by those serving on the STC as well as those employed at the TEA, yet understood the value of their role as "lay experts." It stands to reason that if the petitioners, especially those who espoused "conservative" values, hoped to realize success in influencing textbook decisions, their hopes rested best with the decisions made by the SBE (Maxwell & Crain, 1978).

The Commissioner and his staff at the TEA fall somewhere in between these two decisionmaking groups with respect to the influence they felt from publishers and petitioners. TEA staff admittedly worked to fashion proclamation guidelines that specifically addressed issues raised by petitioners during previous adoptions and looked closely at petitioner complaints regarding books selected by the STC. Nevertheless, Agency personnel were quick to recognize ideologically-oriented protests and kept their judgements pedagogically based. The Commissioner is appointed by the State Board and hires those who work under him at the Agency. This places those at the Agency in the difficult position of having to use their professional judgements within lay confines. In other words, while those at the TEA might know what is needed for the schools, they must also acknowledge what will be acceptable to the state board membership. They did their best to filter the people's voice (represented by petitioner concerns) through a pedagogical lense.

Agency reviewers worked closely with publishers and this relationship, too, had an impact on the writing of the textbook proclamations (see Brammer, 1967). TEA book reviews were not designed to judge the quality or wisdom of decisions made by the STC. Indeed, all books selected were seen as equally good. Furthermore, with few exceptions, Agency staff took for granted that all books succeeded in meeting the guidelines they had established beforehand. After all, the publishers knew just what the state was looking for in textbooks. TEA personnel expected that publishers would be more than willing to make any adjustments deemed necessary at this phase of the process, assuming these adjustments were not major ones. Both staff and the Commissioner

desired a full list of five texts in each subject area; having to remove books for any reason reduced the variety of materials that would eventually be available in Texas schools. In this relationship, the TEA needed the publishers as much as the publishers needed the TEA (see Cronbach, 1955; Edgerton, 1969).

These influence patterns are both interesting and disquieting when seen in relationship to the state's attempt to maintain a system which balanced the values of neutral competence, executive leadership, and representativeness described earlier. The STC is designed to represent a collection of the state's best educators. However, years of classroom and administrative experience do not necessarily equate with competence when these people, and the hundreds of others they select as aides, are asked to perform a task for which most had no preparation and for which they receive little or no support. The assumption that competent educators are competent textbook evaluators does not hold. Furthermore, the data indicate that the degree of neutrality with which they undertake this task is highly questionable given the inclusion of publishers throughout most of the evaluation period. Many recognize that publishers succeeded in focusing these textbook reviews on selective aspects of books being considered. These two facts alone -- the absence of evaluative training and the inclusion of publisher influence -- would seem to dilute the concept of "neutral competence" as it pertains to the first decisionmaking phase.

The system may, however, be realizing the value of executive leadership within its second phase. One cannot doubt that the Commissioner and his staff fulfill this role as they review the books selected by the STC. Respondents from this group acknowledge that, despite the massive amounts of time and energy contributed by the STC, its members do make mistakes. One task for the TEA review is to correct those mistakes as they pertain to the formal textbook guidelines. The TEA staff, which fashioned the guidelines originally, uses its review phase to determine that each book selected does, indeed, meet these prerequisites. The Commissioner and his staff took great pains to carry out the role of "executive leadership" in a way that was fair to their pedagogical colleagues as well as to the public-at-large.

And then we have State Board of Education membership which, elected by the public, epitomizes the value of representativeness. They brought a new vision of textbooks into the process -- that of the citizen who financed the schools and literally bought the books to be used by school professionals. Few publishers bothered to try and verbally defend their wares before this group, and little publisher influence was recognized. Members of this group respected and valued the earlier textbook decisions arrived at by both the STC and TEA; nevertheless, they represented a distinctly different vantage point within the process and felt their oversight power to be valuable in its own right. Petitioners, who were themselves concerned citizens, had a comparatively better chance to influence SBE members' textbook decisions than did publishers. Petitioner input at this decision phase was actually an extension of the "representativeness" value epitomized by the actions of this third decisionmaking group.

This analysis begs several questions. Might there not be some adjustments made to the system to better promote the value of neutral competence? What need is there for having petitioner input throughout the process if, in fact, the SBE is itself the embodiment of citizen representation?

Further questions emerge relative to the distinctions made earlier regarding notions of power and control. As the system existed, power was a bureaucratically designed component: each decisionmaking group was vested with the power to arrive at a set of conclusions subject to the oversight power of the group proceeding it. Control was likened to the idea of dominant influence or sufficient command. From these data one might feel the need to look again at the activities of petitioners and publishers in order to determine whether or not either group enjoyed power or control. Perhaps publishers did exhibit one sort of power over the decisions of those at the TEA? Or perhaps petitioners did project some sort of control over decisions made by the SBE? Before policy recommendations can be forwarded from these data, questions relating to the conceptual distinctions between influence, power and control must be addressed.

Another area from which questions arise has to do with the central role that the textbook guidelines or proclamations played in this procedure. With the exception of the STC members, all

other key participants, including petitioners and publishers, had a role to play in their content and wording. Not surprisingly, as we have seen, each group used these guidelines to their own end during the process. Perhaps question such as "Who influences the textbook guidelines?" and "How are these guidelines, in turn, used by textbook decisionmakers?" should be central to further studies.

Conclusion

Tulley (1983) concludes that the major reasons why twenty-two states continue to control the selection and adoption of textbooks through state-level processes are that such a system (1) controls textbook costs, (2) ensures some degree of curriculum uniformity, and (3) ensures the selection of quality textbooks. The wisdom of state-level textbook selection and the extent to which each of these arguments is viable to such a system is a matter of continued question and debate. This paper describes the influence patterns of textbook protesters and textbook publishers on the Texas textbook selection and adoption process and raises a number of questions related to the relationship between these participants and the state's textbook decisionmakers' attempts to secure quality textbooks for Texas schools. Further research is needed to confirm, refute and/or embellish findings from this study before they can be seen as useful to curriculum decisionmakers and educational policymakers. Meanwhile, the data stand as an historical snapshot of the the way it was in Texas.

ENDNOTES

1. While describing an investigation of *textbook* decisionmaking, I use the phrase *curriculum decisions* with both care and purpose. I do not mean to suggest that the terms "curriculum" and "textbook" are synonymous. My argument is that textbook decisions become curriculum decisions because textbooks have become what Beauchamp (1983, p. 21) describes as a "substitute" for the curriculum. Tanner & Tanner (1980) provide us with a strong definition of curriculum as being "that reconstruction of knowledge and experiences, systematically developed under the auspices of the school (or university), to enable the learner to increase his or her control of knowledge and experience" (p. 43). Conceptually, this is a far cry from curriculum being a book and/or set of materials purchased from a commercial publisher. Nevertheless, these authors later suggest how this "reconstruction of knowledge and experiences" has taken form: "Historically, the textbook has been the key medium through which leading scholars have organized subject matter for instruction. . . .The textbook together with the supplementary materials constituted what came to be referred to as a 'curriculum package'" (Tanner & Tanner, 1980, p. 546). In1969, a report to the Governor of Texas ("Governor's Committee," 1969) noted that 75 percent of students' classroom time and 90 percent of their homework time was spent using textbooks. Since then, at least four major studies have underscored the significance of the textbook as the fundamental source of curriculum (Saylor, 1982, pp. 11-12), noting that use-estimates had risen during the 1970s (Jackson, 1981, p. 9; FitzGerald, 1981, p. 49; English, 1980). No matter how one chooses to define "curriculum," as Courtland et al. (1983) so vividly portrayed in *A Case Study of the Indiana State Reading Textbook Adoption Process*, it appears that educators' practicing definition of curriculum-in-use is textbook.

2. "Key participants" are those individuals who hold a position or role of major significance in some act. In this study, key participants are those persons or groups who take an active and officially sanctioned role in the state's textbook selection and adoption procedures. These include three groups of decisionmakers (members of the State Textbook Committee, Texas Education

Agency staff and the Commissioner of Education, and members of the State Board of Education) and two groups of non-decisionmakers (publishers and petitioners). While I acknowledge the integral role played by numerous others (the most predominantly important group would appear to be the hundreds of people who act as advisors to STC members), to maintain a workable focus I found it necessary to limit key participants to the groups noted above.

3. For the purposes of this study, the term "publishers" refers to members of the elementary and high school (elhi) textbook publishing industry. The term is used to denote anyone connected with the Texas textbook process who has a vested financial interest in any of the books considered for selection and adoption. This includes publishing executives, editors, authors, regional managers, field representatives, consultants, and anyone else who is paid to represent books under consideration. Those familiar with the industry know that the differences among these positions is so great that the definition has little value beyond that of categorization. I, too, am aware of this yet elect to leave the definition as such so as not to jeopardize the anonymity of those within the industry who consented to participate in this research.

4. Texas' textbook guidelines or "proclamations" were created by the Texas Education Agency curriculum staff in concert with the State Board of Education for the purpose of informing textbook publishers of the state's curriculum needs. They consisted of content directives (e.g., "Illustrative materials included in the texts . . . should be informative, closely related to the content and concepts to be developed, and placed where their use will be most convenient.") that were at the same time carefully worded and general in nature.

5. "[T]he state's power to regulate textbooks causes [representatives of the elementary and high school (elhi) textbook industry] to become involved in state political processes" (Thompson, 1976, p. 111). It might seem unwarranted to mention this fact except that, in earlier years, there was some debate as to whether or not textbook decisions should be made by "secret committees" unknown to publishers' representatives (Edmundson, 1931; Mellott, 1953). The proposal of secret textbook adoptions was due to a concern held by many that textbooks were as

likely to be sold to as selected by those responsible for such decisions (Spalding, 1955). While publishers were included in the new Texas scheme, great care was taken to control their activities.

6. For renditions of the public outcry in Texas during the late 1950s - early 1960s, see Raywid (1962) and Nelson & Roberts (1963).

7. In personal interviews with me on July 26 and August 1, 1984, Former Texas Commissioner of Education J. W. Edger, who served throughout the years this process unfolded, described the ways in which the selection and adoption system evolved from its beginnings in 1950 to the point at which it "settled down" around 1961.

8. For a thorough understanding of schoolbook protests see Jenkinson, 1986.

9. Dahl (1976, pp. 25-26) notes that although "influence-terms" such as power, authority, control, persuasion, might, force, and coercion have been central to political analysis throughout history, most theorists (beginning with Aristotle) have assumed that they needed no great elaboration "because their meaning would be understood by men of common sense." Kirst & Walker (1971, p. 488) have the following refinements to add to this common sense understanding and how it relates to curriculum policy:

> By influence we mean the ability to get others to act, think, or feel as one intends (Banfield, 1961). . . . A related concept is what Gergen (Bauer & Gergen, 1968) called points of leverage -- individuals or institutions that have the capacity to effect a substantial influence on the curriculum output of a school system. An individual or group that has leverage is one that can make a big difference on the outcome of conflicts over curriculum policy.

Kaufman (1963, p. 107) adds that

> the profusion of strategies and tactics for applying such leverage is a natural -- indeed, an inevitable -- outgrowth of the political environment. At any rate, multiformity is certainly the

> outstanding characteristic of the means of influence at the disposal of political participants. And these weapons are employed with vigor and imagination.

10. Each State Textbook Committee was required to have at least one member with recognized expertise in one of the curriculum areas for which books were being selected. In each case studied, I interviewed at least one of these recognized experts who served on the STC.

11. See note 3, above.

12. The veil of secrecy around the elhi publishing industry has been critiqued by educators and publishers alike. See, for example, Cole & Sticht (1981).

13. For copies of the surveys used see Marshall (1985), Appendices A, E & F.

14. See Marshall (1985), chapter 3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beauchamp, G. A. (1983). Curriculum thinking. In F. W. English (Ed.), *Fundamental curriculum decisions* (pp. 18-29). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Black, H. (1967). *The American schoolbook*. New York: Wm. Morrow.

Brammer, M. (1967). Textbook publishing. In C. B. Grannis (Ed.), *What happens in book publishing* (2nd ed., pp. 320-349). New York: Columbia University Press.

Brown, E. (1952). The role of the textbook salesman. *Phi Delta Kappan, 33*, 276-277.

Ciolli, R. (1984). The politics of textbooks. *A. P. F. Reporter, 7*(1), 3-7.

Cole, J. Y., & Sticht, T. G. (Eds.). (1981). *The textbook in American society*. Washington, DC: The Library of Congress.

Courtland, M. C., Farr, R., Harris, P., Tarr, J. R., & Treece, L. (1983). *A case study of the Indiana state reading textbook adoption process*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Cronbach, L. J. (Ed.). (1955). *Text materials in modern education*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Dahl, R. A. (1976). *Modern political analysis* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Dessauer, J. P. (1974). *Book publishing*. New York: R. R. Bowker.

Easton, D. (1965). *A framework for political analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Edgerton, R. B. (1969). Odyssey of a book: How a social studies textbook comes into being. *Social Education, 33*, 279-286.

Edmonson, J. B. (1931). The ethics of marketing and selecting textbooks. In G. M. Whipple (Ed.), *Thirtieth yearbook of the National Society for the study of Education, part II: The textbook in American education*. Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing.

English, R. (1980). The politics of textbook adoption. *Phi Delta Kappan, 62*, 275-278.

FitzGerald, F. G. (1981). Textbooks and publishers. In J. Y. Cole & T. G. Sticht (Eds.), *The textbook in American society* (pp. 49-52). Washington, DC: Library of Congress.

Governor's Committee on Public School Education. (1969). *To make Texas a national leader in public education: The challenge and the chance* (Research Report, Vol. II, Public Education in Texas -- Program Evaluation). Austin, TX: Author.

Hall-Quest, A. L. (1918). *The textbook: How to use and judge it*. New York: Macmillan.

How textbooks are adopted. (1972). *Texas Outlook, 56*(11), C2; C3.

Jackson, S. A. (1981). About publishers, teachers, and reading achievement. In J. Y. Cole & T. G. Sticht (Eds.), *The textbook in American society*. Washington, DC: Library of Congress.

Jenkinson, E. B. (1986). *The schoolbook protest movement*. Bloomington IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Jensen, F. A. (1931). The policies of publishing in marketing textbooks. In G. M. Whipple (Ed.), *Thirtieth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, part II: The textbook in American education* (pp. 163-173). Bloomington, IL: Public School Pub. Co.

Jovanovich, W. (1962, January). *Textbooks in our time*. Address delivered on the occasion of the general sales meeting of the School Department of Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., Chicago, Illinois.

Kaufman, H. (1963). *Politics and policies in state and local governments*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kirst, M. W. (1984). Choosing textbooks. *American Educator, 8* (2), 18-23.

Kirst, M. W. (1981). *The state role in educational policy innovation.* Stanford, CA: School of Education, Stanford University.

Kirst, M. W. & Walker, D. F. (1971). An analysis of curriculum policy-making. *Review of Educational Research, 41,* 479-509.

Lasswell, H. (1936). *Politics: Who gets what, when, how.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lest, E. L. (1984). *Textbook selection or censorship: An analysis of the complaints filed in relation to three major literature series proposed for adoption in Texas in 1978.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.

Mann, D. (1977). Participation, representation, and control. In J. D. Scribner (Ed.), *The seventy-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, part II: The politics of education* (pp. 67-93). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mann, D. (1975). *Policy decision-making in education: An introduction to problems of calculation and control.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Marshall, J. D. (1985). *The politics of curriculum decisions manifested through the selection and adoption of textbooks for Texas.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.

Maxwell, W. E. & Crain, E. (1978). *Texas politics today.* St. Paul, MN: West.

Mazzoni, T. L. & Campbell, R. F. (1976). Influentials in state policymaking for the public schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 12,* 1-26.

McDonald, L. C. (1930). *The operation of the multiple-choice textbook law in Texas.* Unpublished master's thesis, The University of Texas at Austin.

Mellott, M. E. (1953). *A study of reactions concerning certain practices in the selling of textbooks to public schools in the United States.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

Nelson, J. & Roberts, G., Jr. (1963). *The censors and the schools.* Boston: Little, Brown.

People for the American Way. (1983). *As Texas goes, so goes the nation: A report on textbook selection in Texas.* Washington, DC: Author.

Peterson, P. E. (1974). The politics of American education. In F. N. Kerlinger & J. B. Carroll (Eds.), *Review of research in education, vol. 2* (pp. 348-389). Itaska, IL: F. E. Peacock.

Plasecki, F. E. (1982). *Norma and Mel Gabler: The development and causes of their involvement concerning the curricular appropriateness of school textbook content.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University.

Raywid, M. A. (1962). *The ax-grinders.* New York: Macmillan.

Saylor, J. G. (1982). *Who planned the curriculum?* West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi Press.

Scribner, J. D. & Englert, R. M. (1977). The politics of education: An introduction. In J. D. Scribner (Ed.), *The seventy-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, part II: The politics of education* (pp. 1-29). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Seidenberger, C. J. (1953). *A study of the adoption, purchase, and distribution of public school textbooks in the various states of the United States.* Unpublished master's thesis, The University of Texas at Austin.

Spalding, W. B. (1955). The selection and distribution of printed materials. In L. J. Cronbach (Ed.), *Text materials in modern education* (pp. 166-187). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Sroufe, G. E. (1977). Evaluation and politics. In J. D. Scribner (Ed.), *The seventy-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, part II: The politics of education* (pp. 287-318). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tanner, D. & Tanner, L. N. (1980). *Curriculum development* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Textbook salesmen may have the greatest single influence over elementary school principals faced with making decisions about curriculum. (1974). *Education USA, 17*, 2.

Thompson, J. T. (1976). *Policymaking in American public education.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Tulley, M. A. (1983). *A descriptive study of the intentionality of selected state level textbook adoption policies.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

van Geel, T. (1976). *Authority to control the school program.* Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Whorton, D. M. (1976). Textbook selection. In S. E. Goodman (Ed.), *Handbook on contemporary education* (pp. 410-414). New York: R. R. Bowker.

Wirt, F. M. (1976). Education politics and policies. In H. Jacobs & K. N. Vines (Eds.), *Politics in the American states* (3rd ed., pp. 284-348). Boston: Little, Brown.